

MORRISON

var

through terror,
ties of inter-
nt down from
bits about the
al equality in
ake sure that
to give. . . .
July 4, 1955.

through terror has
being little sense of
whelming sense of

it to note that the
writer now openly
ive been reiterating
of the deterrent is
rtual equality, and
the result of a race

are not prepared to
r undertakings, and
Kremlin will have
at the undertaking
pell failure at the

problem, is one which
or, for that matter,
em of the basic
of war.

or the present ter-
the West; some of
from the Second
quent struggle for
result of the uneasy
the field of batta-
solve some of the
age and interpreta-
de and economic
territories, of repre-
s, and the problem
re to take place, as
menace of world
s of war renunci-
yond the wit, and
them.

rtially disarm is
gravest doubt
impossibility, and
no one will trust
own allies.
t of the tyrann-
that we so much
tes. It takes an
heer bestiality and
kill"—by break-
ge with the bac-
ed in a recent
with disease and
children, homes
nd women indi-
tens the very and

ecognise that the
bounced; that the
but the practical
tual answer. It is
armed.

FROM
AGE ONE

langer of inter-
major answer to
honest govern-
terests and welfar-

not a "negati-

rs," but was
peace and friend-
is a policy of
through negotia-
commodation some
the peace of the

irmese civilisation
time of William
way of life," he
ay of life on the
t our way of life
eople. We must
it suits us better
re be induced to
one other way of
t way, the We
an way, or am

ON

CA

BLE

m a lecture

States, Will

ressions.

at 7.30 p.m.

Centre

W.C.I.

CE NEWS

WILL NEVER

ANOTHER

member, is

edge Union.

RTERS

h Street, W.C.I.

London, N.W. 1

& Cook Ltd., T

Rd., London,

PEACE NEWS

No. 994 July 15, 1955 4d. (U.S. Air Express Edition: 10 cts.)

Registered as a newspaper.
Entered as second-class matter at post office, Boston, Mass., USA.

Scientists' "Only hope" statement

BERTRAND RUSSELL ANSWERS 10 QUESTIONS

From MARGARET TIMS

THE press conference called by Bertrand Russell in the Caxton Hall on July 9 drew over a hundred newspaper and radio representatives, with all their paraphernalia of microphones and recording machines, to hear science's last warning on the misapplications of science.

Introduced by Professor J. Rotblat, Lord Russell said: "The purpose of this conference is to bring to your notice, and through you to the notice of the world, the statement signed by eight of the most eminent scientists in fields cognate to nuclear warfare about the perils involved in nuclear warfare and the absolute necessity therefore of avoiding war."

He then explained that the statement was the outcome of his broadcast last year. He received many appreciative letters, including one from Professor Joliot-Curie. "I was very pleased to get this because of his being a noted Communist," said Bertrand Russell. "One of the purposes I had in view was to build a bridge between people of opposing political opinions."

Einstein's reply

A draft statement was sent to Einstein and his reply, received on the day of his death, said: "I am gladly willing to sign your excellent statement." The eighteen scientists who were approached to sign the statement were chosen solely for their scientific eminence; six of the signatories were Nobel prize winners. All replies so far received have been sympathetic. Prof. Joliot-Curie has since added his assent, with two reservations:

- (1) That limitation of sovereignty should be agreed by all, in the interests of all;
- (2) war should be renounced "as a means of settling differences between states" (i.e. excluding civil war or revolution).

Bertrand Russell said that in 1945 people were shocked by the atom bomb; but compared to the H-bomb, the atom bomb was now "something like bows and arrows"; and the Bikini bomb was very much worse than the H-bomb. That was the latest development so far. This statement was only a first step. It would then be necessary to get men of science to make an authoritative pronouncement, to be followed by an international conference of scientists from all the countries concerned; a suggested resolution for such a Congress is appended to the statement (see p. 6).

He felt it was the duty of the scientists to make the public and governments aware of the facts by a widespread popular campaign—"this is not a thing scientists do readily, but it is their duty at this time."

They must persuade the world to avoid war, at first by whatever expediency may suggest, but ultimately by means of some international machinery of a world organisation.

Sinister meaning

They should emphasise that science, which had come to have a rather sinister meaning, was capable—if once the question of war is out of the way—of conferring the most enormous benefits on mankind and making the world a happier place than ever before.

Bertrand Russell stressed that he was concerned here with matters of scientific fact, and not with political opinion.

Pressed by questioners to clarify certain points, Britain's leading philosopher (at least in popular influence) did not appear to have any great light to throw on the fundamental problems of war and peace. The moral issues were scarcely touched on, and even on the level of organisation and control no concrete proposals were formulated. The following examples indicate the subjects dealt with:

- Q. Is not world government the only answer to nuclear warfare?
- A. Yes. Prohibition in itself is no good. The only thing is not to have a war.
- Q. Isn't there a danger that this appeal will be exploited by Communist peace propaganda?
- A. It does not take the Communist line, which is simply prohibition of the bomb.
- Q. As all previous efforts to outlaw war have failed, why should this one succeed?
- A. If it is clearly understood by all the great Powers that war brings no chance of victory, or anything that anybody desires, I think it will become possible to create machinery for the avoidance of war.
- Q. Do you propose that no further experiments should be carried, in view of the dangers of fall-out, etc.?
- A. No such proposals have been made.
- Q. Has any group or organisation been formed to carry out your proposals?
- A. An organisation will be necessary, but has

□ ON BACK PAGE

FIRE CHIEF UNDERLINES SCIENTISTS' H-BOMB CALL

"We can never cope with all the fires . . . I have argued with the Government"

POWERFUL rays which would mean certain death to firemen trying to fight fires nearer than ten miles from ground zero, are one of the added terrors of H-bomb warfare, explained Mr. H. M. Smith, Chief Inspector of Fire Brigades, Home Office, when he was addressing the closing session of the British Fire Services Association meeting at Margate recently.

Assuming that a 20 megaton H-bomb were dropped on the heart of London, fires would start in an area of 25 miles diameter.

If a bomb were exploded at or near ground level, the upwards draught would take with it many tons of atomised and pulverised earth. This radioactive matter might be taken up to a height of 60,000 feet. It would gradually drop to earth, carried by the prevailing wind, and would occupy an area of 20 miles width. It was extremely dangerous for extraordinarily long distances; Mr. Smith said that 100 miles was not an over-estimate.

To die—or—to die?

"Anyone in that area must go to ground before that fall-out reaches him, otherwise he will either become very ill, or, nearer the target, he will receive a lethal dose straight away," said Mr. Smith.

Such an area would be out of action for a week, and anyone in it must either get out or go to ground. In addition fire-fighting would be impossible within ten miles of the target on the eastwards side.

In the fall-out area anyone in his own house would have a twenty times greater chance of

★ ON BACK PAGE

IN PARLIAMENT LAST WEEK

Big Four Talks and Disarmament

From our Parliamentary Correspondent

MR. ANTHONY NUTTING, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, was subjected to a close cross-examination on the subject of disarmament in the House of Commons last week.

Replying to Mr. Arthur Henderson (Lab., Rowley Regis and Tipton), he said that the date for resuming meetings of the Disarmament Sub-Committee was discussed at San Francisco by the four Foreign Ministers.

No decision was reached, he added, and the matter was referred for discussion through the diplomatic channel.

Mr. Henderson asked if this meant that the meetings of the Sub-Committee were not likely to be resumed until after the Big Four conference at Geneva.

Mr. Nutting replied: "I do not think that

● ON BACK PAGE



Top: Man-O'-War Bay students singing at the completion of a road built during a work camp with local villagers in Eastern Nigeria. The group includes men from all three Regions of Nigeria—teachers, engineers, policemen and government officials.

African employees at the Rand Refinery, Germiston, S. Africa, trundling trucks of bullion packed for export, under the eyes of a white armed guard. Each year S. Africa provides almost half of the world's new gold. Photo: Chamber of Mines.

TWO WAYS IN AFRICA



□ ON BACK PAGE

July 15th 1955

PEACE NEWS

3 BLACKSTOCK ROAD, LONDON, N.4
Tel: STAMford Hill 2262 (three lines)

Distribution office for U.S.A.:
130 Brattle St. Cambridge 38, Mass.

Mercy does not pronounce on desserts, it aids necessity.
—ST. AMBROSE

BLOCS, NEUTRALISM, AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY

THE conclusions reached by the World Assembly for Peace at Helsinki raise in an acute form the question of the kind of basis for peace in Europe that world opinion should seek to achieve.

The Helsinki meeting approved five points, one of which was "opposition to military blocs" in Europe. Presumably this means that the Eastern Powers would cancel their decision taken at the Conference in Warsaw in May (to set up their own "NATO") in return for the abandonment by the West of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

This can, of course, provide a basis for negotiation but it has to be borne in mind that while the abandonment of Nato by the West means something very definite the cancellation of what was done at Warsaw need not mean very much.

What was settled at the Warsaw meeting, when Marshal Koniev was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the Eastern group of states, did not make any very essential difference to the existing situation. The armed forces of the East European states were already integrated as a united force and orientated along the lines of Russian policy. To scrap the formal superstructure decided upon at Warsaw would not make a great deal of difference. The Eastern states could still constitute a "bloc." Indeed, huge states like the USA and Russia are themselves "military blocs." If "opposition to military blocs" means anything at all it means opposition to the present American and Russian armed power.

That opposition to American and Russian armed power was not in the mind of the delegates to the Helsinki Assembly is shown by their unqualified support for the "collective security" view.

Speaking of the new policy of the Soviet Union described by Mr. Ilya Ehrenburg of Russia, a French delegate, M. Pierre Cot, said:

"The collective security of which Ehrenburg has spoken is the heaven we all want to go to. The policy of blocs is the hell we want to get out of."

The Daily Worker report of Cot's speech goes on:

"Ehrenburg preferred collective security to neutralisation, he said.

"But it was because that security system has not yet been organised that there were people who wanted to see in Europe a chain of independent states that had thrown off the 'iron corset' of the system of military blocs.

"Neutralism was a provisional solution, he concluded.

Collective security remained the final objective." How that security is to be provided was explained by Professor J. D. Bernal on his return to London from the Assembly. Ilya Ehrenburg, he said, proposed "the extension of the idea of European Union to cover the whole of Europe, and include economic integration with security jointly guaranteed by the United States and the Soviet Union.

"This would provide an atmosphere in which the main outstanding problem—the union of Germany—could find its solution without the need for neutrality."

The pattern favoured by Russia and endorsed by the Assembly is thus made clear. The Soviet Union is now prepared to enter into an arrangement with the United States for the joint domination of a Europe conveniently "economically integrated," whose "security" is to be guaranteed by force of Russian and American arms. There is to be a condominium by the two great world powers. A united Europe would surely be the most glittering colonial prize of all time.

This conception is utterly opposed to the idea of neutralism as a means to a positive peace that pacifists have advocated. If militarism is wrong and national independence is right (as the Helsinki Assembly affirmed) neutral states should be encouraged to pursue policies of complete demilitarisation without the necessity of being incorporated willy-nilly in some "protective" security arrangement guaranteed by military powers to whom they will inevitably forfeit their independence.

The rehash of the Locarno plan endorsed by the Helsinki assembly can only appeal to those who think in terms of the pernicious of power; and in the light of today's realities it is a bankrupt formula.

Hiroshima: A call to repentance

ON August 6, 1945, as a result of a decision taken by the government of the United States, an atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima in Japan. Thus the era of atomic war was initiated by the United States. As the tenth anniversary of that tragic day approaches, it is fitting that we pause to reflect on its meaning and that we open our minds and hearts to what the Spirit may have to say to us and to the American people generally. The call that comes to us is, we believe, the call to confession and repentance.

It is easy to imagine what multitudes of us would have said if it had been the German Nazis, the Italian Fascists, the Japanese militarists, or the Russian Communists who unleashed the atomic terror: that it was "like them," that "Americans would not have been guilty of such a crime."

But it was the Americans and not any of these others who were responsible for the bombing of Hiroshima. Moreover, there were no extenuating circumstances to give some semblance of warrant for this leap into a fearsome new type of war. No one has ever suggested that on that August day ten years ago this nation was threatened with extinction or catastrophic defeat, which only resort to the new weapon could avert. Japan was not in a position or equipped to drop a single bomb, atomic or otherwise, on American soil. No responsible person has ever suggested that we "had" to use the A-bomb in order to win the war.

Terror bombing

It has often been said that the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was really an act of mercy because by bringing the war to a quick close it spared many lives. This theory is based on the assumption that a land invasion of Japan would have been necessary to bring the war to an end if the atomic weapon were

not used. It was known, however, at the time, that, in view of the havoc which had already been wrought in Japan, this assumption was an extremely questionable one. The event demonstrated, according to the US Strategic Bombing Survey, that it was false. It is the habit of governments when they resort to a new and more destructive weapon to proclaim that in so doing they are really saving lives and being merciful. The Nazis so characterised the blitz of Rotterdam and other cities. It is a habit which we should not have perpetuated, especially where atomic terror was involved.

Without passing judgment on particular individuals, we hold that Hiroshima was an abhorrent display of national power and the national attitude toward it was in large

To Laurence Housman on his Ninetieth Birthday

By VERA BRITTAINE

*The unexpected years have claimed their toll,
And brought their harvest, sorrowful and gay;
Through rich experience challenging decay,
You have pursued unfaltering your goal.
Unbroken still in honour's golden bowl
Beside the fountain of integrity,
And mortal bonds leave yet unchained the soul,
Forever young to sail a timeless sea.*

*We who have sought to follow in your wake,
And testify to truth with tongue and pen,
Salute your years of witness, nine times ten;
Renewed we vow to fail not nor forsake
The dedicated road where, by God's grace,
His erring sons shall recognise His Face.*

Negotiating from weakness

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S very conciliatory speech in preparation for the coming Four-Power talks are in rather obvious contrast to that of Mr. Dulles at the UN tenth anniversary celebrations when he claimed that every recent helpful step taken by Russia was a vindication of the US Government's "negotiation from strength" policy.

It is doubly unfortunate therefore that the transcript of the proceedings before the House Appropriations Committee should now be published. This shows that on June 10 Mr. Dulles was assuring the Committee that the Russian system is on the point of collapsing . . . "over expanded, unable to meet their commitments, even if they meant to meet them."

Mr. Dulles was doing his best to secure the vote by Congress of \$3,285m. for the President's Foreign Aid Bill, and he calculated that this kind of talk helped the work along. The day before this passage was published President Eisenhower had said to a Press conference "There is no individual in this Government that has ever said that the Russians, the Soviets, are coming to any conference weak."

Both sides should face the fact frankly that they will each be negotiating because they are equally constrained to do so. It is not the strength of the other, but the over-all threat of thermo-nuclear warfare that requires that they shall enter upon real negotiation, and that negotiation means that not one side but both will have to make concessions.

Both sides are negotiating from weakness . . .

Sartre at Helsinki

IT is a fascinating study to read the complete report of the speech delivered by Jean-Paul Sartre at the Helsinki World Peace Assembly.

There are displayed in it the considerable changes that have taken place in the thought of the leading spirits of the World Peace Council—and, of course, in the official Russian attitude—since the last Assembly, and the singular lop-sidedness that has to be taken for granted in all the principal addresses delivered in that gathering.

Speaking of the consequences of atomic war M. Sartre said: "The People's Democracies and the Soviet Union would lose the fruits of the admirable efforts of which they are justly proud; the bourgeois democracies would lose that political liberty of which they so often boast." "Justly proud"; "so often boast." It is a key-note combination. The political liberty of which the Western nations may boast certainly falls short in many respects, but it also represents some values that the admirable efforts of the People's Democracies have yet to realise. Sartre and his colleagues would command more respect for their views if they could drop their "My Russia, right or wrong" attitude.

There is the same lop-sidedness when Sartre is dealing with the evil of dividing the world into two blocs. "In every important circumstance, the particular interests of each country have yielded to the interests of the bloc, that is to the interests of war." That is very true, but why should M. Sartre take the view that because he is speaking in an assembly sponsored by the organs of the Peoples Democracies he should follow by examples taken only from the Western bloc; with two blocs there must be two sets of examples.

Hopeful perspective

IT is in his reference to the futility of banning the H-bomb that M. Sartre

BEHIND THE NEWS

marks the change that has taken place. Banning the H-bomb was the former policy of the World Peace Council and the conferences that it convened.

There is no mention of this fact; no suggestion that a wrong view had been taken formerly but that now the error has been perceived.

Just an indication that "Nothing could be easier and nothing could be more ineffectual than to suppress the bomb by a stroke of the pen. . . Professor Joliot-Curie has shown that the banning of thermo-nuclear weapons can be conceived only within the general perspective of disarmament. War knows no law; if it breaks out, there is no evidence to show that the bomb will not be used. To prevent the use of the bomb we must prevent war."

What is hopeful in M. Sartre's speech is his envisaging as a necessary consequence of "co-existence" the co-operation of the East and the West in the organisation and provision of help for the under-developed countries.

If co-existence is interpreted to mean indifference, with Russia and the US remaining inert and having no relations with each other, there would be a condition that could at any time turn into hostility. With the aid of the under-developed countries no longer motivated as a means to the increasing of the power of a particular bloc, help must be joint undertaking.

The independence of nations who are to profit from this aid cannot be guaranteed unless they are aided by the two great atomic powers at the same time. "Mutual Security Aid" therefore must be replaced by the co-operation of the great powers in providing help for the more backward peoples.

It is an inspiring conception, that if applied would require radical changes in the economic systems of the West. It is, we believe, the moral and peaceful way to bring about revolutionary change; and it would not be without its consequences in the political transformation of the East.

The fight for Africa

THE Times has recently devoted some little editorial attention to the philosophy of British Colonialism.

In a Leader entitled "The Fight for

NO CHANGE

The following description of the attitude of the Manchester Guardian a hundred years ago is taken from one of the articles celebrating the centenary of that journal as a daily newspaper:

"The ideal of world peace, the Manchester Guardian conceded, was commendable, but unfortunately it was not practicable. It was little use ourselves adopting such high-flown peace policies while it was obvious that the cynical rulers of other States would not do the same. World interests could not be much advanced by our solitary efforts, and, if we were to make such efforts, British interests were likely to suffer at the hands of less high-principled foreigners."

Africa," the paper gave its interpretation of the reason why certain African states were invited to the Bandung Conference:

"The desire to draw Africa into the Asian orbit derives from two motives. For the Communists the aim is to deprive the free world of a firm supporting base in the cold war. For the others sentimental anti-colonialism is backed in some cases by considerations of self-interest. Africa could provide an outlet for emigration and cheap manufactured goods to help their sorely pressed economies. Although external influences may lead to the liquidation of colonialism at a comparatively early date, that does not mean that Africa will by then be capable of standing on their own feet, and there is therefore a natural wish to stake an early claim in what might once more become a region open to external enterprise."

"Africa is at the moment firmly linked with Europe, and would profitably remain so, even when the colonial era is passed. The main reason for this is the complementary nature of their trade. Africa produces just those raw materials and foods which are needed for consumption by the highly industrialised society of Europe. In return Europe is well suited to provide managerial and technical personnel, capital and industrial equipment to develop Africa. There may be an increasing participation from America, but there have so far been only very moderate signs of it."

What this means in terms of the cold war is brought out towards the end of the article when the writer says: "Today it is impossible to look at Africa without thinking of defensive needs . . . west coast states, like the Gold Coast, even if they decided to sever their political connection with European metropolitan countries, would still need to come within the Atlantic defence community."

For colonies too?

THE reference to the Gold Coast is significant. It comes on the eve of her promised independence. In the case of western Germany, the Atlantic powers have insisted that sovereignty demands the right for Germany to determine her own foreign policy. Does this principle not apply to ex-colonies too?

A fuller reply to The Times editorial came from an African, J. H. Mensah, who in a letter to the Editor, said:

"What strikes me most is the easy assumption that Africa, even when it has been nominally emancipated, must still continue under the 'protection' of foreign powers and in the position of agricultural appendage of Europe's economics.

"This seriously misjudges the tempo of African nationalism. The emerging African nations must be expected to guard their independence jealously and not barter it away for protection against a Communist threat which is non-existent. Our gratitude for the benefits of western civilization is matched by the bitter knowledge of what is even now happening in North, East, and South Africa. And Europe is likely to find that soon Africans will not want their raw materials processed here and sent back to them to buy. Britain must also prepare herself for the day soon when colonial-earned dollars are no more available in unlimited quantities."

"The only satisfactory basis for future relations seems to me to lie in increasing the export of capital, machinery, and technicians—and fewer troops."

arc circumstances in which it would be quite justifiable to use not only A-bombs but H-bombs and biological weapons.

If we were dealing with an individual who had grievously erred and sinned, we would see that if he did not undergo the experience of repentance and persisted in his sin, he might indeed enjoy a temporary prosperity, but it would mean nothing. His sin would find him out. Its wages would be death.

Deep down in our hearts we know that we cannot be otherwise with a nation and that unless we repent, we shall all likewise perish. Let this Tenth Anniversary of Hiroshima, then, be for the American people a day of repentance. Let it be a day to reflect on what it means that after visiting atomic death on thousands of Japanese in order to disarm them forever, and writing a pacifist clause into their constitution, our government is now desperately engaged in urging rearmament upon Japan. Let us realize once and for all that no people has a moral right to drop H-bombs on another people at any time or for any reason, and let this realisation become the basis of our national policy.

Let us reflect that the nation which took the initiative in discovering and using atomic power for unprecedented destruction has the responsibility now to provide leadership in finding new ways to use another kind of power, the power of love which is for the healing of the nations. That insight will be granted to those who understand that.

*The tumult and the shouting dies;
The Captains and the Kings depart:
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
For heavier heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard,
All valiant dust that build on dust
And guarding, calls not Thee to guard
For frantic boast and foolish word—
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord.*

unmindful of Africa. For South Africa, financially submit to problem is time they h ment subsid curtailed.

The Com £1,000 toward Huddleston, in Johannesburg, keep open h mittee will a their appeal, and Inanda schools unde refusing to racially-biased

There is a munity Edu Gold Coast.

Both these time when independent are described Committe 16, N.Y.

MILLION "NO"
OVER 171 General speech.

The speech by the Amer January 26, mass-circulat title "Can w In this no Peace News of the world baredness by sources thro activity in weapons, by of peace—all by the prospe this increases doubtful—an if war comes if the other s portion.

"We are in solutions no thoughts, new break out of America shot to abolish w powers of the magical."

"STOP

A call to B stop "testin bombs" in effects," was a public me Society of the resolutio of the three

U.S. group out to raise £1000 for Trevor Huddleston

AID to schools in Africa is the special project launched by the American Committee on Africa, an organisation formed to spread information on African affairs and to help forward progressive developments in that Continent.

George M. Houser has recently moved from his post as Projects Secretary of the American Fellowship of Reconciliation to take up the Secretariatship of the ACOA. Last year Houser made a lengthy trip through Africa from the West Coast to the Union. He had previously done much work with the Congress of Racial Equality in combating racial prejudice in the US and had also founded Americans for South African Resistance to encourage the non-violent campaign for racial justice in South Africa.

In a letter on the schools project the American Committee writes:

"At a time when here in the United States strides are being made toward the elimination of segregation in education, we cannot be



GEORGE HOUSER

unmindful of the tragic developments in South Africa. Fortunately there are some schools in South Africa that are "going it alone" financially as long as possible rather than submit to the Government's policy. Their problem is a financial one because up to this time they have received considerable government subsidy which will now be drastically curtailed."

The Committee hopes to be able to send £1,000 towards the £3,000 which Father Trevor Huddleston, courageous champion of Africans in Johannesburg, has said he will need to keep open his school during 1956. The Committee will also send, subject to the success of their appeal, a further £400 to Adams College and Inanda Seminary in South Africa, two schools under American sponsorship which are refusing to accept the Union Government's racially-biased educational policy.

There is also a plan to help a Rural Community Education Centre in Tsito, on the Gold Coast.

Both these projects, particularly vital at a time when efforts are being made to stifle independent African schools in many places, are described in a brochure published by the Committee from 28 East 35th St., New York 16, N.Y.

MILLIONS GET MACARTHUR'S "NO MORE WAR" SPEECH

OVER 17½ million people will be reading General MacArthur's "No more war" speech.

The speech, made at a banquet sponsored by the American Legion in Los Angeles on January 26, appears in the June issue of the mass-circulation Reader's Digest, under the title "Can we Outlaw War."

In this now famous speech, reported in Peace News on February 4, MacArthur spoke of the world's leaders: "They increase preparedness by alliances, by distributing resources throughout the world, by feverish activity in developing new and deadlier weapons, by applying conscription in times of peace—all of which is instantly matched by the prospective opponent. We are told that this increases the chances of peace—which is doubtful—and increases the chances of victory if war comes—which would be uncontrollable if the other side did not increase in like proportion."

"We are in a new era. The old methods and solutions no longer suffice. We must have new thoughts, new ideas, new concepts. We must break out of the strait jacket of the past. America should now proclaim her readiness to abolish war in concert with the great powers of the world. The result might be

"STOP TESTS" CALL TO BIG THREE

A call to Britain, America and Russia to stop "testing or preparing to test hydrogen bombs in view of their terrible genetic effects," was made in Cardiff last month at a public meeting organised by the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). A copy of the resolution was sent to the governments of the three powers and to UNO.

LAURENCE HOUSMAN IS 90 ON MONDAY

Celebrations at Street

LAURENCE HOUSMAN, playwright, grand old man of the British pacifist movement and a member of the Board of Peace News, Ltd., celebrates his ninetieth birthday on Monday.

The occasion will be marked in Street, the small Somersetshire town (pop. 5,000) which is his home, at a social gathering in the canteen of Elmhurst Grammar School.

After coffee and birthday cake, Laurence Housman will give a reading and Kenneth Hudson of the BBC's Bristol studio will offer birthday congratulations. A performance of "Stars and Strikes," will follow, by the Street Players, the dramatic section of the Street Society of Arts.

Roger Clarke, a Quaker, and a member of the well-known shoe manufacturing company will preside.

A report and pictures will appear in Peace News next week.

Greetings from the PPU

Stuart Morris, General Secretary of the Peace Pledge Union, writes:

I would like to add an affectionate tribute to Laurence Housman on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday, personally and on behalf of the National Council of the Peace Pledge Union.

I have been privileged to enjoy the friendship of Laurence for over twenty years and I have very happy memories of his inspiration and help in the early days of the PPU. It

was natural for Dick Sheppard to ask him to be one of the original sponsors, as it was natural for one with Laurence Housman's long record of association with all progressive movements to give the PPU his enthusiastic support. It may not be generally known that when Dick Sheppard died Laurence Housman enabled me to carry on full-time work for the PPU without any charge on its funds in the interim period by making me an allowance equal to the salary which I had been receiving. That was only one example of his generosity and desire to help the PPU.

We all owe him a debt that cannot be discharged in words for the many ways in which he has commended pacifism, through his writing, his speeches, and the inspiration of his personal witness.

As we join in congratulating him not only on reaching his ninetieth birthday, but on the way in which he has enriched his day and generation and continues to do so in "the unexpected years," we can also congratulate ourselves on the honour which his presence amongst our sponsors confers on the PPU, and on the fact that we can all claim him as a fellow-pacifist.

GO IT, OLD BOY! YOU'VE DONE IT WELL!

By Reginald Reynolds

TO give any brief account of such a prolific writer as Laurence Housman is, of course, an impossibility. But a ninetieth birthday party is not a book-reviewers' rally or a Witches' Sabbath for dramatic critics; so I propose to talk about Laurence Housman as a person.

When I first came to know him, in 1926, he was living with his sister, Clemence Housman, at Street, in Somerset. Many people thought of Miss Housman as a distinguished, elderly lady who kept house for her brother. Laurence himself was one of the few who revered her as a remarkable writer whose worth had never been properly appreciated.

I date my friendship with "Uncle Laurence" (as we called him in those parts) from two events which happened about the same time. One occurred when the first literary effort I ever showed him was returned with a comment so derogatory that I admired Laurence's frankness and afterwards knew that I could always trust the sincerity of his approval. The other was my own returning of one of Clemence Housman's books, which I had been lent. I said it was better than anything of Laurence's which I had ever read: it was, in fact (and still remains) the most shattering literary experience I have ever had.

The delight of "Uncle Laurence," as I praised his sister's work, was something I shall never forget. Like most writers, he has his pride; but where his elder brother was concerned (the Shropshire Lad) or his sister's best work, he would always take a back seat by preference. So my disparaging comment was as sound a basis for friendship as his criticism of my early work. But my preference for Clemence Housman's work did, at least, follow the great admiration which I had so often expressed for Laurence's creation of "Juniper" and "St. Francis."

I say "creation" because it is my considered opinion that the St. Francis of Laurence's "Little Plays" is a character of creative imagination, whom I much prefer to his historical prototype. As to "Juniper," he is almost wholly a Laurencian character, and one of his most lovable inventions.

From 1929 onwards my connection with Laurence was mainly personal and political. Laurence had been an ardent advocate of Women's Suffrage while I was a boy. He had also become a pacifist; but his inclination was not towards political controversy or public platforms. It was that fact which made his emergence as a controversialist doubly admirable.

He became a strong supporter of Gandhi's aims and methods; a good friend to the No More War Movement and the War Resisters International; and finally—when Dick Sheppard founded the old friend—Peace Pledge Union—one of the most active



POLEMICS AND PENCE

THE art of polemics (disputations in politics or religion) seems to have been dying out. That is what has made our General Elections and our church conferences so dull these days. There has been little room for strenuous ideas or strenuous minds to advocate them.

But the situation need not remain so. If the kind of discussions now going on in the pacifist movement could be taken out into wider circles, some interest might be put back into our politics and our religion. People might find it more entertaining than television even! Or more inspiring—which wouldn't be difficult.

One of the functions of Peace News is to provide a forum for discussion on important issues of the day. Freedom of thought is fundamental to peace and peace-making.

Your contributions to the PN Fund this half-year have been encouraging. You can help to ensure that PN continues to serve its cause of peace and freedom by seeing to it that the Fund figures are as healthy at the end of the year as they are now.

TOM WARDLE.

Contributions since July 1: £27 13s. 5d. Total since January 1, 1955: £990 7s. 9d.

Please make cheques, etc., payable to Peace News Ltd., and address them to Lady Clare Annesley, Joint Treasurer, Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4.

**The shocked young lady said—
You mustn't take Christianity that far!**

Peace News correspondent

DEBBY

THE pacifist open-air poster exhibition on the Market Place could not be missed; the sun added lustre to its brilliance, and children chanted the anti-war slogans as though to benefit the blind.

One young lady (a real charmer to look at!) decided it was all "a blind," "another Communist venture," and she stayed to argue awhile.

Supposing her to be a regular church attendee we suggested that Jesus Christ would not disagree with what the posters had to say, but she responded "Good heavens, you mustn't take Christianity that far!" Perhaps it was her good looking self that drew a crowd, for we found ourselves with a friendly host formed into an unexpected and informal discussion group.

A young Salvationist walked round the stand which displayed no less than twenty-one posters and had something quite different to say. "You're quite right," he said in humble voice, "I'm convinced that the more one grows in the Faith, the more convinced must one become of the rightness of the pacifist position." Another young man wanted to know more about conscientious objection and many helped themselves to leaflets and Peace News. Few declined to have the leaflets offered to them, very few of which were thrown away, and none of which were torn up then and there.

As the day drew on, Alec Lea was able to bring his poster-dressed Land Rover and caravan to the Market Place, and these added to the general interest.

The Land Rover bonnet served well as a platform for Alec Lea, Frederick Forder and Tony Allwright, and a large crowd gathered for the open-air meeting. A young man, a stranger, asked to speak, and he told the crowd of the situation today in Germany from where he had just returned. He spoke as a National Service man, but it was obvious that he had for some time felt the pacifist challenge.

We all felt encouraged. We were aware of the general feeling, hecklers excepted, that a new way must be found to deal with international problems.

Time reviews pacifist pamphlet

TIME magazine reported recently on the publication of the American Quaker pamphlet, "Speak Truth to Power."

In objective language, which included some important quotations from the pamphlet, Time defined the basic argument. "Speak Truth to Power" is the fourth of a series of key documents published by the American Friends Service Committee since the commencement of the cold war, but is particularly significant in that, as Time put it, "its stand on pacifism is more radical than any of its predecessors." It is available from Housman's Bookshop, price 1s. 9d. post free.

Eleven said "lets produce the bomb"

THAT this country is justified in producing the atom bomb, was the motion carried by eleven to six, with several abstentions, at the Brighton and Hove Debating Society meeting on May 31.

Mr. Lane, proposing the motion said that Britain could not abolish the bomb while others were producing it, and that the only way to stop war is to make it so infernal that no one will venture to start it.

Opposing the motion, Mr. S. J. Looker said, "More than 130,000 casualties among a population of 300,000 cannot be regarded with equanimity. And that was the result of one atom bomb. We have no justification for waging war on innocent children, and the possible effects of the hydrogen bomb on future generations is disturbing research scientists."

Pioneers of the new Africa—2.

ALEC DICKSON

By Reginald Reynolds

I DID not meet Alec Dickson on my African journey. His work at that time was in a part of the Continent which I did not visit. But I had heard of Dickson and what I was told had made me curious to know more about his work.

I had recently become interested in work camps and even more recently in Africa. The idea of applying the work camp method to the solution of some African problems had been buzzing in my brain from Cairo to Cape Town. It was not an original idea: some people I met were already trying it out, and there were others of whom I heard stories. One of these seemed to be an almost legendary character, and that was Alec Dickson.

Soon after my return to England, in 1953, Dickson rang me up. I had not heard he was in London and was very surprised to find that he even knew my name, let alone my interests and my "secret" telephone number. We met the same morning, with Mrs. Dickson, who had shared fully in the arduous life of her husband, in West Africa. From that time to the present day we have enjoyed the exchange of ideas by correspondence and met when it was possible.

Alec Dickson is not a pacifist nor is he an anti-imperialist, but we found much common ground and I have learned a great deal from him, in spite of many disagreements on fundamental points.

Dickson was educated at Rugby and New College, Oxford. He wanted to be a foreign correspondent and joined the editorial staff of the Yorkshire Post, which he left for the Daily Telegraph in 1937. But at Oxford he had already come under the influence of Sir Alexander Paterson, a man whose name is well known to all who were concerned with penal reform in the years before the war. "A.P." interested Dickson in social work, especially among young people. This interest, pursued originally as a spare time voluntary occupation, was eventually to shape Alec Dickson's career.

By 1938 he had become dissatisfied with journalism. Essentially a man of action, he felt then that he was merely a spectator writing about events in which he wanted to play an active part. Those were the stirring days of "Munich," and Dickson spent most of that winter in Czechoslovakia, trying to help Social Democrats from the Sudetenland. Later, during the war, he volunteered for army service in Africa. He travelled widely in East and Central Africa, mainly in connection with a special assignment which gave him unusual opportunities to know and appreciate Africans; and before he returned to Europe he had been for a short time Adviser on Social Welfare to the Government of Uganda.

In less than two years he was back in Africa—this time with the task of inaugurating a Mass Education Scheme in the Gold Coast. Into his 33 years he had packed an amazing variety of experience, of which I have only given the briefest outline. Even his vacations as an undergraduate had been spent abroad, always studying and observing. He had seen youth organisations at work in many

countries, noting the dangers as well as the possible advantages inherent in them. He had, for example, closely observed the Hitler Youth and *Arbeitsdienst*. He knew what he wanted to achieve, how to achieve it and what to avoid. But each situation had in it new ingredients, and the Gold Coast was to test once more his adaptability.

The word "adaptability," when applied to Alec Dickson, may make some people smile. His superiors in administration have not always found him easy-going, especially when faced by bureaucratic stupidity. In the Gold Coast he was, at first, so frustrated by the attitude of the Government that he complained to the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and protested to the Governor. Some awkward questions relating to the dispute were asked in the House of Commons. There was, of course, no proof as to who had briefed the questioners; but when the campaign



NIGERIA'S MPs LEAD THEIR PEOPLE TO WORK. Holding a pick-axe (shaven-headed, centre) is Mallaam Dauda Haruna, Member of the House of Assembly, Northern Nigeria. In 1953 he attended the Nigerian Constitutional Talks in London with the Colonial Secretary. Holding a rock is Assistant Education Secretary, Afrikpo Native Authority.

Others in this voluntary work camp group include another Member of the House of Assembly, a Public Relations Officer, a senior clerk in the Cameroons Development Corporation, and teachers from Northern and Eastern Nigeria.

resulted in an allocation of £40,000 for Dickson's work he found that he had won a Pyrrhic victory by "shooting it out" with the local bureaucracy. Yet there was essential adaptability in Alec's approach; for, if his superiors often found him stubborn and intransigent, Africans came to regard him as a friend—and to win African friendship a European must be adaptable.

In London once I had the pleasure of introducing Alec Dickson to Alick Nkhata, the African singer. I saw then how easily and quickly Dickson could become friendly with an African, but realised that it was hardly a fair test, as Alick Nkhata is himself so warm-hearted and likeable. But I have before me now the record of Alec Dickson's last job, from 1951 to 1954, at Man O' War Bay, British Cameroons. Much of that record consists of letters from young Africans who attended Dickson's training courses there. These letters contain much information, from which it is possible to form some idea of the value of Dickson's work. His comments on them are the measure of his relationship with the writers—remarks characterised by a frankness which is only possible between people who thoroughly understand one another.

Alec had originally applied for a transfer from the Gold Coast to escape the "stonewalling" of administrators. He met, at first, a similar opposition in Nigeria and the Cameroons (due to the natural fear which all Colonial Administrations have of any effort to arouse popular enthusiasm, and particularly

that of educated youth). Ironically enough the Gold Coast—now under the leadership of Kwame Nkrumah—used its measure of self-government to extend on a vast scale the work for which Alec had struggled with so much difficulty against British officialdom. In his new work, however, Dickson obtained the powerful support of a senior British official noted for his independence. The result was the training scheme at Man O' War Bay for which Alec Dickson's name is best known today.

For a description of the training scheme I can best recommend the reader to Alec's own account of it in the current number of International News,* the monthly bulletin of the Association of International Work Camps for Peace. Another article of Dickson's in the Summer Bulletin of the International Voluntary Service for Peace,† discusses the role of the European volunteer in work camps in "undeveloped territories," and a third will be found in the current number of One World on "Training for Citizenship." I can only very briefly sum up here the nature of Alec Dickson's last job and those of his principles with which I find complete agreement.

Alec believes that the important thing is not doing things for people, but showing them (if necessary) how to do what is necessary themselves and creating the sense of individual responsibility and of community which is the essence of true citizenship. Quite apart from any racial problems, he sees the danger of "Western" education in under-developed countries: too easily it breaks up old tribal customs without supplying the educated with any new social standards of obligation to the community.

At Man O' War Bay he took groups of African students, Government and business employees and other young men, who received a training which toughened them physically and demonstrated the value—also the fun—of group enterprise. Though he learned something from the "Outward Bound" technique he never fell for its more brash and crude conceptions. He always realised that his task was not simply to turn out tough he-men, but to emphasise that the spirit in which a project is undertaken is more important than mere material achievement. Each training course ended with a work-camp, in which trainees worked alongside uneducated villagers so that they could appreciate the life problems of people from whom a pure academic education might have separated them as effectively as a "colour bar."

Alec Dickson's next work is to be with UNESCO, to head their "Fundamental Education" mission in Iraq. The good wishes of all who really care about the subcontinent millions in Asia and Africa will undoubtedly go with him.

* Friends House, Euston Road, London N.W.1. 6d.
† 19 Cambridge Villas, London, W.11. 6d.

‡ National Peace Council, 29 Gt. James Street, London, W.C.1. May-July issue.

EVERYWHERE NEWS, PLYMOUTH, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LEYTONSTON, ST. PANCRAS, LIVERPOOL, ST. GEORGE'S, PEACE COUNCIL, FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE, 32 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C.2.

THE PLEDGE UNION, ACTION GROUP, GLASGOW, HYDE PARK, MANCHESTER, LE

WHEN Ron Huzzard says that the Peace Pledge Union seems to be no further advanced than when Dick Sheppard was alive, I presume he is referring to the fact that it takes no direct part in politics. As I understand the position, the PPU exists to convert individuals to pacifism and to keep a registry of them, and I think it has done and is still doing these jobs very well. The fact that it does not engage directly in politics does not mean that it is backward, but merely that political action is not part of its work.

Many of us who took part in the last election feel that the time has now arrived when political action is essential and it is to meet this need that the Fellowship Party has been created. Its job is in the political field and it is open for pacifists who think that this is the right course to join and put their hearts and souls into the tremendous task ahead. They can also belong to other existing pacifist organisations, for they do not engage in direct political action, which is not part of their job.

To those pacifists who still cling to the declining Labour Party, I would like to quote Dick Sheppard when he said "The Labour Party was not the answer." And, of course, he has been proved right. Yet some pacifists still place other issues before their pacifism by remaining in the Labour Party. How ludicrous it is to imagine that the Party which introduced peace time conscription, agreed with the dropping of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and adopted the manufacture of nuclear weapons in this country—all while they were overwhelmingly the largest party in the House—will ever perform such a political "about face" as to adopt a pacifist policy?

Men of principle are no longer allowed to vote according to their conscience, if they are to remain in the Labour Party. The old sparkle has gone for ever and in its place is the capitalism of the Trade Unions, whose leaders now command more power than any business men. What is badly needed in politics today is the spirit of fellowship, the knowledge that a Party is working for a just cause, strict adherence to Christian and moral principles, and the determination not to be deflected from doing and saying what one believes to be right.

ERIC FENNER,
General Secretary.

The Fellowship Party,
14 Parkgate Rd., S.W.11.

I HOPE that Ivan Geffen's stimulating article (PN July 1) will be widely discussed, and that discussion will lead to action. Although my views are similar to Mr. Geffen's like him, I am an ex-member of the Labour Party who left it because of its intolerance. I am not convinced that it is necessary to form another political party, but a new political movement is most certainly needed.

The Election results have served to obscure the fact that there already exists a strong public opinion in favour of renunciation of the H-bomb. Shortly before the Election a News Chronicle Gallup Poll showed that 53% of voters (or 62% of those with definite opinions) believed that Britain should not make the Bomb. Yet Sir Richard Acland obtained under 14% of the votes cast, and other anti-Bomb candidates fared worse.

The Gallup Poll, not the Election Poll, measures the true opinion of the country. If the right methods are adopted now the popular desire for renunciation of the Bomb can be harnessed as a political force for peace. The way to do this is not to set up a new national party, which would at best receive the support of a small minority, but to form an association of local groups, each independent and each responsible for political action in any constituency in the area covered by its membership.

No attempt should be made by these groups to fight every election. From time to time

As this is a free service, we reserve the right to select notices for publication, we nevertheless desire to make it as complete a service as we reasonably can, and therefore urge organisers of events to:

ABBREViations: Anglican Pacifist Fellowship APP; Fellowship of Reconciliation FoR; Peace Pledge Union PPU; Society of Friends SoF; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom WILPF.

Friday, July 15
PLYMOUTH : 7.30 p.m.; Friends Mtg. Ho., Stuart Morris, "Pacifism in the Atomic Age"; PPU and SoF.

Every week!

SUNDAYS

HYDE PARK : 3 p.m.; Pacifist Youth Action Group. Every Sunday. PYAG.

GLASGOW : Open-air mtg., Queen's Park Gates, Victoria Rd. 7.45 p.m. Campbell Wilkie and Keith Bovey. Glasgow PPU.

TUESDAYS

MANCHESTER : 1-2 p.m.; Deansgate Blitz Site. Christian pacifist open-air mtg. Local Methodist ministers and others. MPF.

THURSDAYS

LEYTONSTONE : 8 p.m.; Friends Mtg. Ho., E.10 and E.11 Group PPU.

LONDON, W.C.1 : 1.15-1.45 p.m.; Church of St. George the Martyr, Queen St. Weekly lunch-hour Service of Intercession for World Peace. Conducted by clergy and laymen of different denominations.

LONDON, W.C.1 : 7.30 p.m.; Dick Sheppard Ho., 6 Endsleigh St. Pacifist Youth Action Group.

FRIDAY

EVERYWHERE, anytime, street-selling PEACE NEWS. Copies supplied "sale or return". Posters free. Send for your quota to 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.

or collect from the steps of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Trafalgar Square between 5.30 and 6.30 p.m.

SATURDAYS

LIVERPOOL : 7.30 p.m.; Pier Head, Open Board. Meeting. Liverpool and District Peace

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Labour Party controversy

they should put questions, through the Party organisations, to prospective Parliamentary candidates in each constituency on the H-bomb and other issues relevant to peace through conciliation.

Elections should be fought only where:
(a) there is little to choose between the replies of the prospective Party candidates; and
(b) an alternative candidate is available who is acceptable to the group and who has a personality likely to attract the voter.

I am sure that peace groups outside the Labour Party could exert a great deal of influence on it if they were prepared when necessary to support Independent candidates. In a large number of constituencies the present Labour MP or prospective candidate deserves the support of the peace movement, which should do what it can to strengthen him in the conflict between his beliefs and his obligation to submit to Party decisions.

S. W. GREEN.

43 Wulfstan Way,
Cambridge.

* * *

I SHARE the feeling of most of your contributors on the need for a new political party but the practical difficulties are enormous; money might be obtained but publicity and audiences denied. Most of your correspondents underestimate these difficulties and are far too optimistic when they speak in terms of winning Parliamentary seats.

The task of such a new party would be to revitalise our political life by establishing honesty, integrity and conscience as the criteria of political life and matching these qualities with a programme both practicable and imaginative and devoid of much of the dogma and myth that handicaps Socialist thought.

But before such a party could be established as a contestant for Parliamentary power it would have to make itself felt at the local level. I am certain that local politics would give this party the opportunity to prove itself and to demonstrate its ability. One member of such a party in a local Council should be enough to revolutionise the work of the Council. If a new party begins at the bottom it will be making the right start for it will not be founded on vague or grandiose hopes but on a realistic assessment of the needs of the country and of the possibilities of action.

CAMPBELL WILKIE.

12 Baldric Rd.,
Glasgow, W.3.

THE truth which pacifists have been all too slow to grasp is that pacifism is a way of life which carries with it political, economic, cultural and moral implications and obligations, for which reason it is easily side-tracked and rendered impotent.

One consequence of this lack is that pacifists are always waiting for things to turn up. They merely look for certain symptoms in the body politic and then prescribe the stock remedies, many of which have become almost proprietary brands.

The time has come to turn one's attention from symptoms to causes, for we have entered one of those periods when fundamental changes in the life and ends of persons and of nations can alone save civilisation from collapse.

The Labour Party has reached a dead end. The Socialist ideal of the early pioneers has become the Welfare state, which is already degenerating into the Ilfracombe state.

The whole trend of industrialism during the last fifty years has been to robotise the human person, and to compensate him for his spiritual losses by increased cash.

Workers' control of industry with high quality production and lofty conceptions of

working for the common good, is now a spent dream. Nationalisation has lost its social content. All that now matters is money, which socialists and capitalists alike accept as the sole incentive in industry.

The idol of this new materialism is automation. It has given the US six times more cars than the rest of the world put together. This sets the pace and gives the cue to the devotees of progress in the West. Thus we British are told that by 1980 the toll of our cars will have quadrupled. What of road deaths, and the effects on our food production of the construction of 1,000 miles of new arterial roads on which cars may speed at 70 miles an hour?

This example foreshadows a rabid conflict for the earth's resources, and thus for export markets. Those who succeed will dominate the earth, and those who lose will go Communist. Under the impulses of this new materialism, with its devouring economies, can we expect a spirit of sharing among the nations?

It is these devouring economies, with their expanding material demands, group struggles for differentials and class struggles for political power, that will determine the politics, including the issue of war and peace in the future. They constitute the politics and the way of life of the economic man. The way of peace is the way of life of creative man, whose culture will insure that material ends and means subserve spiritual ends and means.

Unless our pacifism and our politics are rooted in a way of life which unifies every part of man's being they will be futile. It rarely happens that an organisation is able to make fundamental changes in its policies and aims and survive. Whether the Labour Party or the Peace Pledge Union can do that remains to be seen.

WILFRED WELLOCK.

Orchard Lea,
New Longton, Preston.

* * *

DISHEARTENED by the Right-Wing leadership's attitude towards Sir Richard Acland, its dictatorship towards the Liverpool Constituency Party in the democratic choice of a candidate, and its past behaviour at Annual Conferences, I am taking steps to discontinue representing my Trade Union Branch as Delegate to the Coventry North Labour Party.

I am in entire agreement with the Manifesto of the London Christian Party (Now the Fellowship Party—Ed.) as outlined by Loverside, Fenner, Malone, and others, and shall endeavour to help to the best of my ability.

A Labour Party which believes in H-bomb manufacture is not the Party for me.

W. J. ELLIS.

94 Dallington Rd.,
Coventry.

The Third Way

THE war in which we find ourselves today is between two diametrically opposed theories—capitalism v. Communism. The very nature of each ideology allows no compromise; Communists will hear no rot about the individual's right to use any means for a profit, and capitalists will have no part of a society in which a man's identity is sacrificed to the mass. As the psychological and military power of each system grows, the tension increases; everyone is forced to make a decision as to which is the side of justice and liberty—which side he will join. Recently, however, there has arisen a Third Way, opposed to these two extremes of philosophy and headquarters for all who would change society (eliminate imperialism, poverty and war and replace them with freedom, prosperity and peace). This movement, unfortunately, lacks one essential—it does not have a clear under-

standing of its own prejudices, shortsightedness and self-interests.

For instance, one of its avowed purposes is to create a "neutral bloc," especially considering Germany. As long as both the USA and USSR are fighting for absolute control of their respective halves, the Third Way is justified in firmly standing alone. But when one of the nations announces its desire for a neutral Germany and the other violently rejects the idea, what is the position of the Third Way? Can it still be equally opposed to both sides? If it is truly a Third Way; i.e., not only negatively uncommitted psychologically, emotionally or intellectually to either side, but positively committed to a definite programme, it cannot.

(Miss) D. M. RUTGER.

1861 Morton Ave.,
Los Angeles 26, California.

Communists and pacifists

REV. KENNETH RAWLINGS (PN June 10) is confused over a practical way of life because he is part-blind on the question of the vices to which mankind is so much given.

I wonder what attitude he takes to drunkenness. He will there perhaps admit that the inebriate, however charming a person otherwise, is most unreliable in business and practical dealings, because too frequently under the influence of drink. The inveterate drinker who pledges himself never to drink again will not only see his health improve, but likewise will meet with more success in his dealings with most people.

Who more than a clergyman should look upon the taking of human life as a vice? Most religions call it a sin, perhaps the most deadly. The civil code classes it a crime, perhaps the worst of all.

When carried out en masse as in war, many psychologists, Havelock Ellis for instance, call it the poison most pernicious to mankind. Many people are such strict observers of the civil code and of the moral teaching of religion and psychology that they oppose war at large, where murder is carried out on such a vast scale, and in our days quite indiscriminately.

As an opponent of the last two wars, I welcome any effort anyone makes to oppose preparations for a third. I welcome all, no matter what their political party or religious creed. But present day opponents of war are, nevertheless, divided into two groups.

On the one hand are those who will never think the vice of murder justified. On the other are people who may, at any moment, once more run amok as previously they have done, whether as Communists, or Tories or any other creed.

If we are to avoid a new orgy of impatience and intolerance—which is precisely what war is—people who dread this no doubt final devastation for mankind, must be free from the vice of murder. A small section of the Labour Party who are professed pacifists has come to understand this. I look upon them as pioneers. For should every party, sect or whatnot, in every country, sort itself out into members who renounce murder and those who don't, we may soon have enough cool heads in various sections of mankind to oppose war preparations—nay, war at large—in a truly effective way. Failing such sorting, I, for one, persist in having much misgivings.

FRANCOISE DELISLE.

26 Aysgarth Rd., S.E.21.

A World Citizen

WITH regard to the conditional exemption granted to Michael Maybury reported in your last issue, your contributor should have mentioned that one of the grounds upon which he claimed exemption was that he had taken the pledge of the Commonwealth of World Citizens.

HUGH J. SCHONFIELD.

13 Prince of Wales Terrace,
London, W.8.

PEACE NEWS. Applications invited for the post of sub-editor. Experience of make-up essential. Write: Editor, Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, N.4.

PEACE WORK is available for all volunteers at Peace News office. Daytime and every Wednesday evening we shall be grateful for help. Write, phone or just drop in to Peace News (STAnford Hill 2262), 3 Blackstock Rd. (above Fish & Cook, stationers), Finchley Park, N.4.

SITUATIONS AND WORK WANTED

MABEL EYLES Duplicating Service, 395 Hornsey Road, N.19. (ARC, 1765).

WHOLE OR PART-TIME representative North Cornwall Area available. Box 653.

SPECIAL OFFER TO NEW READERS

You can give PEACE NEWS nine weeks postal trial for 2s. 6d. only (U.S. Office 13 weeks for \$1).

Please send PEACE NEWS for..... to the name and address below.

I enclose £.....

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

STANDARD RATES:

HOME EDITION (G.B. and overseas)
1 year 21s., 24 weeks 10s., 12 weeks 5s.
Or order from your newsagent.

U.S. AIR EXPRESS EDITION
1 year \$4, 6 months \$2

PEACE NEWS

3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.

130 Brattle St., Cambridge 38, Mass. USA

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

TERMS: Cash with order, 3d. per word, minimum 2s. 6d. (Box No. 6d. extra). Please don't send stamps in payment, except for odd pence. Maximum length 60 words. Address for Box No. replies: Peace News, 3 Blackstock Rd., N.4.

LATEST TIME for copy: Monday morning before publication.

DISPLAYED ADVERTISEMENTS are required by the Thursday eight days prior to publication.

WHEN REPLYING to advertisements please mention PEACE NEWS

MEETINGS

INTERNATIONAL CLUB, Bath. Tuesdays, 7.30. Literary Institute, 18 Queen Sq. All welcome.

KING'S WEIGH HOUSE Church, Duke St., nr. Bond St., Tube. "The Word of the Woman." Sunday, July 17, at 11 a.m. Miss Minnie Pallister (BBC) "Woman's Hour" broadcaster.

MANCHESTER: 3 p.m.-7 p.m.; Platt Fields. Open-air Mtg. PPU.

NOTTINGHAM: 7.30 p.m.; Market Sq. Open-air Mtg. Fred Forder and others. PPU.

Saturday, July 18

LONDON, N.W.1: 1.15 p.m.; Friends International Centre, 32 Tavistock Sq. Bring your own sandwiches, tea provided. Friends Rural Work in India. B. Choudhri and Drs. Edward and Vivien Abbott. FSC.

NOTTINGHAM: 7.30 p.m.; Friends Mtg. Ho., Friar Lane. Any Questions on Peace.

Wednesday, July 20

BRISTOL: 7 p.m.; at home of Issa Preuss, 24 Woodbridge Rd., Knowle, Bristol 4. Group mtg. PPU.

LONDON, W.C.1: 1 p.m.; Friends International Centre, 32 Tavistock Sq. Albert Hyndman, B.A., "The Pros and Cons of Caribbean Federation." WILPF.

Saturday, July 23

EPSON: 7.30 p.m.; Methodist Church Hall, Ashley Rd. (nr. traffic lights). Hugh Brock speaks on ways of advocating the pacifist policy. SoF, PPU, FoR, APF, IFL.

</

WHERE WILL THAMES BE?

—Fire Chief

survival than in the open. In a cellar or basement or in a ground floor room with bricked-up windows, he would be entirely safe. But what would householder do if, whilst in his cellar, he had his roof or top story fired by the heat flash of a bomb exploding 15 miles away?

"Is he to go up on the roof, put out the fire and receive a lethal dose of radiation?" asked Mr. Smith, "or does he just stay inside and get burnt to death?"

"That is just what would happen with an H-bomb. It is something that can occur 1,000 times over."

Mr. Smith continued, "However strong a fire service we have anywhere we can never hope to extinguish or cope with all the fires we shall get. If we ever have these bombs we can only hope to do our best, and the government must understand we can only cope with a certain part of the problem and by no means the whole of it."

The Government realised that an efficient fire service was the backbone of any civil defence organisation, and was alive to the manpower problem. A new training centre in Lancashire would be taking over 500 Class H reservists a fortnight, and it was hoped that 10,000 men would pass through it in a year.

In the event of H-bomb warfare, the service would have to rely on emergency water.

"The Government will have an extremely difficult decision to make one day," he said. "They will have to make a start on water, and

they can only do that when, in their opinion, the threat of war is a real one.

"I have argued with them about this and have told them that you cannot hope to provide the amount of water we should need in a matter of weeks. I doubt if it could be provided in months."

Where will the Thames be?

Mr. Smith was asked whether the country's canal system would be of use as a potential source of emergency water. He answered that this would be radioactive, and firemen would not be allowed near it.

"An H-bomb on London might even temporarily alter the course of the River Thames," he said, and pointed out that canal banks would certainly be burst in the explosion.

TOM WARDLE

TOM WARDLE has accepted a call to the pastorate of Underbank Chapel, Stannington, Sheffield, as a Unitarian student pastor and will be leaving Peace News next week.

In London last Tuesday Tom Wardle gave a talk on his impressions of the USA gained during a recent lecture tour. A report will appear in Peace News next week.

Announcing this move to the meeting, Robert Greacen, the chairman, said that he had greatly appreciated Tom Wardle's contributions to the paper and he was glad to know that he would continue to write for the paper although no longer on the staff.

The Scientists' H-bomb Statement

IN the tragic situation which confronts humanity, we feel that scientists should assemble in conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction, and to discuss a resolution in the spirit of the appended draft.

We are speaking on this occasion, not as members of this or that nation, continent or creed, but as human beings, members of the species Man, whose continued existence is in doubt. The world is full of conflicts; and, overshadowing all minor conflicts, the titanic struggle between Communism and anti-Communism.

Almost everybody who is politically conscious has strong feelings about one or more of these issues; but we want you, if you can, to set aside such feelings and consider yourselves only as members of a biological species which has had a remarkable history, and whose disappearance none of us can desire.

We shall try to say no single word which should appeal to one group rather than to another. All, equally, are in peril, and, if the peril is understood, there is hope that they may collectively avert it.

We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, for there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: what steps can be taken to prevent a military contest of which the issue must be disastrous to all parties?

The general public and even many, men in position of authority, have not realised what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs. The general public still thinks in terms of the obliteration of cities. It is understood that the new bombs are more powerful than the old, and that, while one A-bomb could obliterate Hiroshima, one H-bomb could obliterate the largest cities, such as London, New York and Moscow.

No doubt in an H-bomb war great cities would be obliterated. But this is one of the minor disasters that would have to be faced. If everybody in London, New York and Moscow were exterminated the world might, in the course of a few centuries, recover from the blow. But we now know, especially since the Bikini test, that nuclear bombs can gradually spread destruction over a very much wider area than had been supposed.

It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima.

Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radio-active particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

No one knows how widely such lethal radio-active particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race. It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal death —sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say, is that these results are possible, and no one can be sure that they will not be realised. We have not yet found that the views of experts on this question depend in any degree upon their politics or prejudices. They depend only, so far as our researches have revealed, upon the extent of the particular expert's knowledge. We have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy.

Here, then, is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful, and inescapable: Shall we put an end to the human race? or shall mankind renounce war? People will not face this alternative because it is so difficult to abolish war.

The abolition of war will demand distasteful limitations of national sovereignty. But what perhaps impedes understanding of the

situation more than anything else is that the term "mankind" feels vague and abstract. People scarcely realise in imagination that the danger is to themselves and their children and their grandchildren, and not only to a dimly apprehended humanity. They can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love are in imminent danger of perishing agonisingly. And so they hope that perhaps war may be allowed to continue provided modern weapons are prohibited.

This hope is illusory. Whatever agreements not to use H-bombs had been reached in time of peace, they would no longer be considered binding in time of war, and both sides would set to work to manufacture H-bombs as soon as war broke out, for, if one side manufactured the bombs and the other did not, the side that manufactured them would inevitably be victorious.

Although an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments* would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes. First: any agreement between East and West is to the good in so far as it tends to diminish tension. Second: the abolition of thermo-nuclear weapons, if each side believed that the other had carried it out sincerely, would lessen the fear of a sudden attack in the style of Pearl Harbour, which at present keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We should therefore welcome such an agreement, though only as a first step.

Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but, as human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether White or Black, then these issues must not be decided by war. We should wish this to be understood, both in the East and in the West.

There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our quarrels? We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new Paradise: if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.

RESOLUTION: We invite this Congress, and through it the scientists of the world and the general public, to subscribe to the following resolution:—

"In view of the fact that in any future world war nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and that such weapons threaten the continued existence of mankind, we urge the Governments of the world to realise, and to acknowledge publicly, that their purposes cannot be furthered by a world war, and we urge them, consequently to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them."

Professor P. W. BRIDGMAN (Professor, Harvard University; Foreign Member of Royal Society, London; Nobel Prize for Physics); ALBERT EINSTEIN; Professor L. INFELD (Professor, University of Warsaw; Member of Polish Academy of Sciences; Joint author with Einstein of "The Evolution of Physics" and of "The Problem of Motion"); Professor H. J. MULLER (Formerly a professor in Moscow, India, etc. Now a professor at University of Indiana; Nobel Prize in physiology and medicine for discovery of the production of mutations with the help of X-rays); Professor C. F. POWELL (Professor, Bristol University; Nobel Prize for Physics).

Professor J. ROTBLAT (Professor of Physics in the University of London, at St. Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College); BERTRAND RUSSELL; Professor HIDEKI YUKAWA (Professor Kyoto University; Nobel Prize for Physics); Professor JOLIOT-CURIE.

* Professor Muller makes the reservation that this be taken to mean "a concomitant balanced reduction of all armaments."

"All pacifists now?"

Under the United Nations Charter the Powers have already renounced war, except as a means of resisting aggression... The whole problem arises from the determination of free peoples that life on this earth would not be worth living under Communist domination... The truth is that we are prepared to risk thermo-nuclear war, with all its hideous consequences, rather than risk having everything that makes life valuable destroyed by an evil creed.—Daily Telegraph, July 11, 1955.

more would die lingeringly and in extreme agony over perhaps a period of years.

It is the refusal to face the truth of this appraisal of the consequences of a nuclear war which makes the continued repetition of high-flown phrases about dying rather than submitting to an evil creed, possible at all.

*

If faced with the choice of living, even in metaphorical chains, or dying by excruciating torture, most people would choose to live. The rallying cry of death rather than Communism is nothing more than a piece of dishonest claptrap; there is no such choice.

It seems very unlikely that the USSR is contemplating the spread of Communism by means of wiping out themselves and everyone else! That such a purpose "cannot be furthered by a world war" would seem to be obvious without a resolution from a large number of eminent scientists to tell us so.

If the spread of Communism is to be halted it will certainly not be achieved by threats of total annihilation, but only by the so-called "free world" taking steps to show that Social Democracy has something better to offer than Communism to the under-developed countries, and the backward and exploited races.

War renunciation is plainly the first step, because then, and only then, the huge sums now spent upon armaments could be released for this work of human development and the creation of goodwill.

If the nine scientists had called upon other scientists to join in a conscientious objection to the use of their brains and their skill for the purpose of war, some impact might have been made upon the conscience of the public.

As it is, their call is to the base elements of fear and expediency. It is as though they said: "It no longer pays to steal; let us, therefore, be honest men."

The world still awaits a high call to renounce war, not because nations can no longer further their purposes by going to war, but because it is the moral principle on which foundation alone peace can be established.

10 QUESTIONS

FROM PAGE ONE

not yet been created.

Q. Do you dissent from recent official statements that the dangers from radio-active fall-out have been exaggerated?

A. Yes. Many scientists have made equal authoritative statements to the contrary.

Q. Are you in favour of unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons on moral grounds?

A. No. I am emphatically not in favour of unilateral renunciation. Anything that is done must be by agreement, so as not to favour either side militarily.

Q. If an international force were set up, would it not be more effective if armed with nuclear weapons?

A. Yes, it probably would. It might perhaps have the more primitive forms of nuclear weapons that are not so dangerous.

Q. It has been suggested that this appeal might be exploited by the Communists. Do you not need the support of the Communists just as much as the West?

A. Most emphatically yes. We must find something on which both Communists and anti-Communists can agree, e.g. the dangers of radio-active fall-out.

Q. Is a popular campaign necessary to bring home the dangers; and how could it be waged behind the "iron curtain"?

A. A popular campaign is most vital. I believe that public opinion has already influenced the United States government towards sanity. In Communist countries the approach would be mainly through scientists and heads of states.

Coming shortly

BANDUNG

An on-the-spot description of the Asian African Conference.

(44 pages, map and illustrations and full text of final communiqué)

Dr. Homer A. Jack

(Peace News' reporter at the Conference)

2s. (Postage 2d.)

HOUSMANS BOOKSHOP

3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4.

"THEY MUST SUCCEED"

Eve of Four-Power Meeting Rally.

Hyde Park, 3 p.m. Sunday July 17

Hear Rev. L. P. Bliss, Mrs. P. Cusden MBE, JP., Gordon Schaffer, William Wainwright.

LONDON PEACE FEDERATION

I RENOUNCE WAR AND I WILL NEVER SUPPORT OR SANCTION ANOTHER

This pledge, signed by each member, is the basis of the Peace Pledge Union.

Send YOUR pledge to

P.P.U. HEADQUARTERS

Dick Sheppard House, Endsleigh Street, W.C.1

Published from 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4, by Peace News Ltd. Printed by Fish & Cook Ltd., Goodwin Press (T.U.), 135 Finsbury Rd., London, N.4.

Enquiry in print take that stand.

Mr. Turton welcomed the in

That is ext

Mr. Henderson not prepared to

ment and state

take that stand.

Mr. Turton welcomed the in

That is ext

Mr. Turton welcomed the in